Anomalous transport model with axial magnetic fields

Karl Landsteiner[a*] and Yan Liu[b†]
[a]Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC, C/ Nicolás Cabrera 13-15,
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain and
[b]Department of Space Science, and International Research Institute
of Multidisciplinary Science, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China

We study anomaly induced conductivities in the presence of an axial magnetic field. A main ingredient is that the total axial magnetic flux has to vanish. This results in finite conductivities even when exact charge conservation forbids local relaxation terms. We work out consequences in a simple model with coupled energy and electric charge transport. The axial anomaly is responsible for an anomalous Hall current that leads to local charge pumping in an axial magnetic field. This in turn drives an axial analogue of the chiral magnetic effect and leads to enhanced electric but diminished thermoelectric conductivity. The effect due to thermal gradients is a consequence of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly. We also interpret the anomalous contribution to the entropy current as a generalized anomalous thermal Hall effect.

arXiv:1703.01944v2 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 10 Mar 2017

Introduction. — Chiral anomalies [1, 2] and the specific transport phenomena induced by them such as the chiral magnetic and the chiral vortical effects have been extensively discussed in the recent years (see [3, 4] for reviews). While originally they were invoked to explain observed charge correlations in the final state of heavy ion collisions the focus has shifted towards condensed matter physics. In particular much of the interesting, exotic physics of Weyl semi-metals can be attributed to anomalous transport phenomena.

A theoretically [5, 6] and experimentally [7–10] well studied effect is the enhancement of the electric conductivity along an applied external magnetic field. It is commonly explained via the chiral magnetic effect and the axial anomaly. Combining the axial charge (non-)conservation

$$\dot{\rho_5} = c\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} - \frac{1}{\tau_5}\rho_5\,, \tag{1}$$

and the chiral magnetic effect

$$\vec{J} = c\mu_5\vec{B}\,, \tag{2}$$

leads immediately to the observed signal of enhancement of the electric conductivity $\Delta\sigma \propto \tau_5 (cB)^2$.

The axial anomaly is really a mixed anomaly between the vector and axial symmetries. The corresponding anomaly coefficient d_{VV5} is totally symmetric and therefore the axial analogue of the CME also exists

$$\vec{J} = c\mu\vec{B}_5\,. \tag{3}$$

While at first sight this is a straightforward generalization of (2) it leads to some immediate puzzles. The first one is that the Bloch theorem forbids non-vanishing equilibrium values for exactly conserved currents [11]. In the case of the chiral magnetic effect this theorem is obeyed because of the subtitles in the definition of the axial chemical potential. The (electric) chemical potential in contrast is free of these problems and uniquely defined. The other puzzle is that a parallel argument along (1)-(2) involves the exactly conserved electric charge and seemingly leads to infinite conductivity.

We will first elaborate on the nature of an axial magnetic field from a quantum field theoretical point of view emphasizing that such a field must necessarily be massive. We argue then that this leads to the constraint of vanishing total flux and this resolves both puzzles. In the context of Weyl semimetals vanishing total axial magnetic flux follows simply from the fact that the vector potential A^5_μ is an effective field that exists only inside the material but has to vanish outside [12, 13]. Again this means that the integrated axial magnetic flux has to vanish. Axial vector fields in Weyl semimetals can be engineered via application of strain [14, 15]. Enhancement of the electric conductivity in strain induced axial magnetic fields has been studied before in [16, 17]. Anomalous thermoelectric conductivities in usual magnetic fields have been discussed in chiral kinetic theory in [18, 19] and in a theory of essentially decoupled chiral fluids in [20]. Our treatment is valid in the semiclassical regime and results in a non-local integral over a diffusion kernel. We consider also the coupled thermo-electric transport and the effects of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly and interpret the anomalous contribution to the entropy current as anomalous thermal Hall effect.

On the nature of the axial magnetic field. — Cancellation of anomalies is often invoked as a consistency condition on quantum field theoretical models. In the case of a $U(1)$ symmetry this is easily understood already at the classical level of gauge field dynamics. Assuming a Maxwell kinetic term the equations of motion

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = J^\nu\,, \tag{4}$$

imply that the current has to be conserved $\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0$. If one uses however a massive Proca action instead of the Maxwell action this restriction does not arise

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} + m^2 A^\nu = J^\nu\,, \tag{5}$$

it implies only that the longitudinal component of the gauge field is given by the divergence of the current. It is possible to formally preserve gauge symmetry by explicitly introducing a (pseudo)scalar degree of freedom θ via the so called Stückel-



Figure 1. The integrated total magnetic flux of an anomalous gauge field must vanish.

berg mechanism and write the mass term as

$$S_{\text{mass}} = \int d^4x \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \theta - mA_\mu)^2 . \tag{6}$$

If one also includes an axion coupling of the form

$$S_{\text{axion}} = -\frac{c}{m}\int d^4x\, \theta\, \tilde{F}F , \tag{7}$$

the total action is gauge invariant with $\delta\theta = m\lambda$ and $\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \lambda$ despite the anomaly in the fermion current.

Another problem arises however since the the axionic coupling is not renormalizable. Quite generically anomalies in a gauge current make the theory either mathematically inconsistent if one insists on massless gauge bosons or non-renormalizable if one allows for mass terms of the vector field [21]. It has been emphasized however long ago in [22] that from an effective field theory point of view there is nothing wrong with massive gauge fields coupling to an anomalous current. For definiteness we specialize now to the axial anomaly and an axial magnetic field $\vec{B}_5 = \vec{\nabla}\times\vec{A}_5$.

Let us consider a region with non-vanishing $\vec{B}_5$ flux as in figure 1. The total flux can be measured via Stokes theorem as the line integral of the contour encircling the region of flux

$$\Phi_5 = \iint_\Omega d\vec{S}\cdot\vec{B}_5 = \oint_{\partial\Omega}\vec{A}_5\cdot d\vec{x}. \tag{8}$$

In cylindrical coordinates parameterizing the plane containing $\partial\Omega$ we can therefore take

$$A^5_\varphi = \frac{\Phi_5}{2\pi}. \tag{9}$$

This is independent of the size of the enclosing contour $\partial\Omega$. The mass implies that such a field configuration is associated with a potential energy of

$$V = m^2\int^R r dr d\varphi\, (A^5_\varphi)^2 g^{\varphi\varphi} \sim m^2\frac{(\Phi_5)^2}{2\pi}\log(R), \tag{10}$$

where R is the radius of $\partial\Omega$. Since the flux is independent of the radius we can consider the limit $R\to\infty$ which would cost infinite energy and therefore such a field configuration is not allowed for a massive vector field. It follows that the total axial magnetic flux has to vanish

$$\Phi_5 = 0. \tag{11}$$

The constraint of vanishing magnetic flux of an anomalous gauge field applies therefore not only to Weyl semi metal physics but is generally valid in field theory. This solves the first puzzle. The total current induced by the axial magnetic effect (3) vanishes.

Anomalous transport. — We will consider the simplest model showing the effect. It relies on energy and charge conservation only. In the context of Weyl semimetals this seems to be well justified by the fact that momentum relaxation is the fasted relaxation process and energy and electric charge are the exactly conserved quantities. From a quantum field theoretical point of view this amounts to work in an ensemble with fixed Lagrange multiplier for the momentum, i.e. velocities $\vec{v} = 0$[1]. Anomalous transport needs of course a source of chirality. This is usually taken to be the axial chemical potential μ_5 but in our situation the axial magnetic field acts as chiral source. The conservation equations are

$$\dot{\varepsilon} + \vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{J}_\varepsilon = \vec{E}\cdot\vec{J}, \tag{12}$$

$$\dot{\rho} + \vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{J} = c\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}_5 . \tag{13}$$

Formally the charge current has an anomaly in (13). This is because it is the *covariant* form of the current. The exactly conserved electric current has to be identified with the *consistent* current $\vec{J}_{\text{cons}} = \vec{J}_{\text{cov}} - c\vec{A}_5\times\vec{E}$. The (covariant) anomaly is then better viewed as charge inflow produced by the anomalous Hall effect. The Hall current is a physical current because the axial field A^5_μ is a physical field contrary to a true gauge field such as the electromagnetic potential A^μ.

To discuss transport we write down constitutive relations and take as thermodynamic forces the gradients in the thermodynamics potentials and electric and axial magnetic fields.

$$\begin{pmatrix}\vec{J}_\varepsilon\\ \vec{J}\end{pmatrix} = L\cdot\begin{pmatrix}\vec{\nabla}\left(\frac{1}{T}\right)\\ \frac{\vec{E}}{T} - \vec{\nabla}\left(\frac{\mu}{T}\right)\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}\hat{\sigma}_B\\ \sigma_B\end{pmatrix}\vec{B}_5 . \tag{14}$$

The transport coefficients are constrained by the second law of thermodynamics. We define the entropy current as

$$\vec{J}_s = \frac{1}{T}\vec{J}_\varepsilon - \frac{\mu}{T}\vec{J} + \eta_B\vec{B}_5 . \tag{15}$$

Following [23] we impose the second law $\dot{s} + \vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{J}_s \geq 0$ and use the thermodynamic relation $Tds = d\varepsilon + \mu d\rho$ to find the constraints $det(L)\geq 0$ and $L_{11}\geq 0$ and $L_{22}\geq 0$. The electric field and the gradient of the chemical potential have to enter in the linear combination shown in (14). Entropy is produced only by the symmetric part of the matrix L and Onsager's reciprocity relations guarantee that L is symmetric in the absence

[1] Due to the dissipation less nature of the chiral magnetic effect this does not mean that the momentum vanishes. Rather a magnetic field will induced a constant momentum density $\vec{\mathcal{P}} = \hat{\sigma}_B\vec{B}$.

of time reversal breaking. The axial magnetic conductivities are almost completely determined

$$\sigma_B = c\mu \quad , \quad \hat{\sigma}_B = \frac{c\mu^2}{2} + c_g T^2 \quad , \quad \eta_B = \frac{c\mu^2}{2T} + c_g T \,. \quad (16)$$

Field theory [25, 26], holography [26], chiral kinetic theory [27] and geometric arguments [28] show that the a priori undetermined integration constant c_g is given by the coefficient of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly

$$\partial_\mu J_5^\mu = b\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\lambda} R^\alpha{}_{\beta\mu\nu} R^\beta{}_{\alpha\rho\lambda} \quad (17)$$

as $c_g = 32\pi^2 b$. Even if the perturbative gravitational anomaly is absent an argument based on a global mixed gauge gravitational anomaly shows that the T^2 term is still present [29]. Generalizatons to higher dimensions and higher spin fields have been discussed in [30–32].

For a single pair of Weyl fermions of opposite chiralities $c = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}$ and $b = \frac{1}{384\pi^2}$. We also note that if we assume presence of axial charge the coefficient $\hat{\sigma}_B$ has also a quadratic dependence on the axial chemical potential. For simplicity we set $\mu_5 = 0$.

The entropy current can be written as

$$\vec{J}_s = (1/T, -\mu/T)\cdot L \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \vec{\nabla}(1/T) \\ \frac{\vec{E}}{T} - \vec{\nabla}\left(\frac{\mu}{T}\right) \end{pmatrix} + 2c_g T \vec{B}_5 \,, \quad (18)$$

and therefore receives no contribution from the usual anomaly but does have a contribution from the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly. This has been previously observed in [33]. As we will argue this is the origin of the anomalous thermal Hall effect.

Induced conductivities. — Now we investigate the linear response of this system to a gradient in the temperature and an external electric field aligned with the axial magnetic field. We assume

$$\vec{B}_5 = B_5(x,y)\hat{e}_z \,, \qquad \vec{E} = E\hat{e}_z \,, \quad (19)$$

$$\mu = \mu_0 + \delta\mu(x,y) \,, \quad T = T_0 + \delta T(x,y) + z\nabla_z T \,. \quad (20)$$

The sources are the gradient in the temperature and the electric field (alternatively a gradient in the chemical potential) along the z direction. The axial magnetic field is taken as a background.

Since the axial magnetic field is not uniform in the (x,y) plane the system will react to the local charge inflow induced by the anomalous Hall and axial magnetic effects by building up diffusion currents. Eventually a stationary state is reached. This stationary state can be obtained from the constitutive relations and the conservation equations by dropping the time derivative. We find that the fluctuations δT and $\delta\mu$ have to fulfill a system of Poisson equations

$$L\cdot Y \Delta_\perp \begin{pmatrix} \delta T(x_\perp) \\ \delta\mu(x_\perp) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2c_g T_0 & c\mu_0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \nabla_z T \\ E \end{pmatrix} B_5(x_\perp) \,. \quad (21)$$

Here $\Delta_\perp$ is the two dimensional Laplace operator ($\Delta_\perp = \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2$) and $Y = \frac{1}{T_0^2}\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ \mu_0 & -T_0 \end{pmatrix}$ is the transformation matrix relating the the thermodynamic forces $\delta(1/T)$ and $\delta(-\mu/T)$ to the fluctuations δT, $\delta\mu$. Once the fluctuations are determined they can be plugged into the *anomalous part* of constitutive relations (14) to find the anomaly induced currents

$$\begin{pmatrix} J_\varepsilon^z \\ J^z \end{pmatrix} = -B_5(x_\perp) u(x_\perp) \Sigma \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \nabla^z(\frac{1}{T}) \\ \frac{E}{T} - \nabla^z(\frac{\mu}{T}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

with the conductivity matrix

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 2c_g T_0 & c\mu_0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \cdot (L\cdot Y)^{-1} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -2c_g T_0 & c\mu_0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} T_0^2 & 0 \\ -T_0\mu & -T_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

and the solution to the Poisson equation $\Delta_\perp u(x_\perp) = B_5(x_\perp)$, i.e.

$$u(x_\perp) = \int dx'_\perp G(x_\perp - x'_\perp) B_5(x'_\perp) \,. \quad (24)$$

We have written the induced conductivity matrix as acting on the naturally defined thermodynamic forces. This has the advantage that the Onsager reciprocity relations are automatically satisfied, i.e. Σ is symmetric,

$$\Sigma_{11} = \frac{1}{\det(L)} T^2 \Big((L_{22}(2c_g T^2 + c\mu^2)^2 + c^2\mu^2 L_{11}) - \\ - 2c\mu(2c_g T^2 + c\mu^2) L_{12} \Big) \,, \quad (25)$$

$$\Sigma_{22} = \frac{1}{\det(L)} c^2 T^2 \Big(L_{11} - 2\mu L_{12} + \mu^2 L_{22} \Big) \,, \quad (26)$$

$$\Sigma_{12} = \frac{1}{\det(L)} cT^2 \Big(2c_g T^2 (\mu L_{22} - L_{12}) + \\ c\mu(L_{11} - 2\mu L_{12} + \mu^2 L_{22}) \Big) \,. \quad (27)$$

Using $a+b \geq 2\sqrt{ab}$ for $a,b \geq 0$ and the fact $L_{11} \geq 0, L_{22} \geq 0, \det(L) \geq 0$ one shows that Σ_{11} and Σ_{22} are positive. Furthermore the total current is proportional to the expression

$$-\int d^2x_\perp d^2x'_\perp B_5(x_\perp) u(x'_\perp) = \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\tilde{B}_5(-q)\tilde{B}_5(q)}{q^2} \quad (28)$$

which for a real function $B_5(x_\perp)$ is positive definite. Thus the response matrix in the net current described by (23) has the same properties as L since it determinant is also positive

$$\det(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{\det(L)} 4c^2 c_g^2 T^8 \,. \quad (29)$$

The electric and thermoelectric conductivity is defined as $\vec{J} = \sigma\vec{E} - \alpha\vec{\nabla}T$. The thermoelectric conductivity α is non-vanishing only because of the contribution of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly,

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 - uB_5 \frac{\Sigma_{22}}{T} \,, \quad (30)$$

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 \Big(1 + uB_5 \frac{1}{\det(L)} 2cc_g T^4 \Big) \,, \quad (31)$$

with $\sigma_0 = L_{22}/T$ and $\alpha_0 = (L_{12} - \mu L_{22})/T^2$. Measuring therefore the total current induced by a temperature gradient in the background of an axial magnetic field is an experimental signature of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly. Note however that the electric conductivity is enhanced whereas the thermoelectric conductivity gets diminished.

Examples. — Finally we want discuss two simple examples. The first one can be taken as a simple model of edge states in a Weyl semimetal. Edges of Weyl semimetals support surface states, the so called Fermi-arcs [34]. From the perspective of anomalous transport they can be seen as the currents induced by an axial magnetic field with support localized on the edge [17, 35]. We therefore assume the axial magnetic field configuration

$$\vec{B}_5(x) = \hat{e}_z \bar{B}_5 \big[\delta(x) - \delta(x-L)\big]. \tag{32}$$

The first thing to notice is that according to (15) there is an anomalous entropy current localized on the edges. If there is a temperature gradient such that $T(x=0) = T_1$ and $T(x-L) = T_2$ a net entropy and energy current

$$\vec{J}_s = 2c_g(T_1 - T_2)\bar{B}_5\hat{e}_z \quad , \quad \vec{J}_\varepsilon = 2c_g\bar{T}(T_1 - T_2)\bar{B}_5\hat{e}_z \tag{33}$$

are flowing along the z direction, where $\bar{T} = (T_1 + T_2)/2$. We interpret this as the anomalous thermal Hall effect. Thus the anomalous contribution to the entropy current can be understood as a generalization of the anomalous thermal Hall effect.[2] Previous discussions of the relation between thermal Hall effect and gravitational anomalies are [36, 37]. The solution to the Poisson equation is

$$u(x) = \bar{B}_5 \big[x\Theta(x) - (x-L)\Theta(x-L) - \frac{L}{2}\big], \tag{34}$$

where the integrations constants are fixed by demanding regularity at large x and that $\int_0^L u(x)dx = 0$. The latter guarantees that no net chemical potential is generated. The product

$$-B_5(x)u(x) = \bar{B}_5^2 \frac{L}{2}\big[\delta(x) + \delta(x-L)\big], \tag{35}$$

is positive as expected. The total induced currents are therefore proportional to

$$I_{\text{net}} \propto -\int dx B_5(x)u(x) = \bar{B}_5^2 L. \tag{36}$$

In the second example we study a cylindrical field configuration. In polar coordinates

$$\vec{B}_5(r) = \hat{e}_z \bar{B}_5 \big[\Theta(R-r) - \frac{R}{2}\delta(r-R)\big]. \tag{37}$$

[2] It is tempting to define the anomalous heat current as $\delta\vec{J}_{Q,\text{anom}} = T\delta\vec{J}_{s,\text{anom}} = 2c_g T\delta T\vec{B}_5$. We note however that a "heat current" does not exist [38].

A constant flux inside the cylinder $r < R$ is compensated by an edge flux localized at $r = R$ such that the total flux vanishes. The solution to the Poisson equation with the same boundary conditions is

$$u(r) = \bar{B}_5 \Big[\frac{R^2}{8} + \frac{r^2 - R^2}{4}\Theta(R-r)\Big], \tag{38}$$

the total current again is proportional to the integrated product $B_5(r)u(r)$ in turns out to be

$$I_{\text{net}} \propto \bar{B}_5^2 R^4/16 \sim \bar{B}_5^2 A^2 \tag{39}$$

where A is the cross sectional Area. This is a a very unusual scaling with the area. Intuitively this can be explained by the fact that the diffusion allows the build up of more charge for larger radius R. This scaling has also been derived in [16].

Conclusion. — We have developed a simple model of anomaly induced transport in the background of an axial magnetic field. The anomalous charge inflow is counterbalanced by outflow via diffusion. Despite the fact that the total integrated flux vanishes a net current is be obtained. The electric conductivity is enhanced as already found in [16, 17]. The thermoelectric conductivity experiences an anomaly induced modification only if the axial-gravitational anomaly is present and turns out to be diminished. The entropy current has contributions not only from the dissipative diffusive terms but also from an dissipationless effect due to the axial-gravitational anomaly. A physical interpretation can be given as generalized anomalous thermal Hall effect. These two are clear and hopefully experimentally testable signatures of the mixed axial-gravitational anomaly.

Acknowledgments. — We thank Y.-W. Sun, S. Golkar and S. Sethi for useful discussions. The research of K.L. has been supported by FPA2015-65480-P and by the Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa Programme under grant SEV-2012-0249. The research of Y.L. has been supported by the Thousand Young Talents Program of China and grant YWF-16-BJ-Y-57 from Beihang University.

* karl.landsteiner@csic.es
† yanliu@buaa.edu.cn

[1] S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2426.
[2] J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, Nuovo Cim. A **60** (1969) 47.
[3] D. E. Kharzeev, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **75** (2014) 133, [arXiv:1312.3348].
[4] K. Landsteiner, Acta Phys. Polon. B **47** (2016) 2617, [arXiv:1610.04413].
[5] H. B. Nielsen and M. Ninomiya, Phys. Lett. **130B** (1983) 389.
[6] D. T. Son and B. Z. Spivak, Phys. Rev. B **88** (2013) 104412, [arXiv:1206.1627].
[7] Q. Li *et al.*, Nature Phys. **12** (2016) 550, [arXiv:1412.6543].
[8] X. Huang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. X 5, 031023 (2015).
[9] J. Xiong *et al.*, Science 350 (6259), 413-416.
[10] C. Zhang *et al.*, Nature Commun. 7, 10735 (2016).

[11] N. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.8, 085011 [arXiv:1502.01547].

[12] K. Landsteiner, Phys. Rev. B **89** (2014) no.7, 075124, [arXiv:1306.4932].

[13] P. Hosur and X.-L. Qi, Comptes Rendus Physique **14**, 857, [arXiv:1309.4464].

[14] A. Cortijo, Y. Ferreiros, K. Landsteiner and M. A. H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115** (2015) no.17, 177202, [arXiv:1603.02674].

[15] A. Cortijo, D. Kharzeev, K. Landsteiner and M. A. H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. B **94** (2016) no.24, 241405 [arXiv:1607.03491].

[16] D. I. Pikulin, A. Chen and M. Franz, Phys. Rev. X **6** (2016) no.4, 041021, [arXiv:1607.01810].

[17] A.G. Grushin, J. W.F. Venderbos, A. Vishwanath, and R. Ilan, Phys. Rev. X **6** (2016) no.4, 041046, [arXiv:1607.04268].

[18] R. Lundgren, P. Laurell and G. A. Fiete, Phys. Rev. B **90** (2014) no.16, 165115, [arXiv:1407.1435].

[19] B. Z. Spivak and A. V. Andreev, Phys.Rev.,B **93** ,085107, [arXiv:1510.01817].

[20] A. Lucas, R. A. Davison and S. Sachdev, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **113** (2016) 9463, [arXiv:1604.08598].

[21] D. J. Gross and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **6** (1972) 477.

[22] J. Preskill, Annals Phys. **210** (1991) 323.

[23] D. T. Son and P. Surowka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 191601, [arXiv:0906.5044].

[24] K. Landsteiner, E. Megias and F. Pena-Benitez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** (2011) 021601, [arXiv:1103.5006].

[25] S. Golkar and D. T. Son, JHEP **1502** (2015) 169, [arXiv:1207.5806].

[26] K. Landsteiner, E. Megias, L. Melgar and F. Pena-Benitez, JHEP **1109** (2011) 121, [arXiv:1107.0368].

[27] G. Basar, D. E. Kharzeev and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013) 161601, [arXiv:1307.2234].

[28] K. Jensen, R. Loganayagam and A. Yarom, JHEP **1302** (2013) 088, [arXiv:1207.5824].

[29] S. Golkar and S. Sethi, JHEP **1605** (2016) 105 [arXiv:1512.02607].

[30] R. Loganayagam, JHEP **1311** (2013) 205 [arXiv:1211.3850].

[31] S. D. Chowdhury and J. R. David, JHEP **1511** (2015) 048 [arXiv:1508.01608].

[32] S. D. Chowdhury and J. R. David, JHEP **1612** (2016) 116 [arXiv:1604.05003].

[33] M. A. Stephanov and H. U. Yee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116** (2016) no.12, 122302, [arXiv:1508.02396].

[34] X. Wan, A. M. Turner, A. Vishwanath and S. Y. Savrasov Phys. Rev. B 83 (2011) 205101

[35] M. N. Chernodub, A. Cortijo, A. G. Grushin, K. Landsteiner and M. A. H. Vozmediano, Phys. Rev. B **89** (2014) no.8, 081407 [arXiv:1311.0878].

[36] R. Nakai, S. Ryu and K. Nomura, arXiv:1611.09463.

[37] M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **85** (2012) 184503 [arXiv:1201.4095].

[38] R. .H. Romer, American Journal of Physics 69, 107 (2001).